

STRIVING FOR PEACE



ANDREAS G. PAPANDREOU



INDIAN COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL RELATIONS

Striving for Peace

©1986 Indian Council For Cultural Relations

Jacket Design

Kanti Roy

Published by

Lalit Mansingh

Director-General

Indian Council for Cultural Relations

Azad Bhavan , Indraprastha Estate

New Delhi – 110002

Printed in India at

Vap Enterprises

H-24 , Green Park Extension

New Delhi – 110016

CONTENTS

Welcome Address

Striving for Peace

Welcome Address

Your Excellency, Dr Andreas Papandreou, Prime Minister of Greece,
Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

AS THE PRESIDENT of the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, I extend to all of you a most cordial welcome to this 22nd Maulana Azad Memorial Lecture. It gives me great pleasure to welcome His Excellency Dr Andreas Papandreou who has graciously accepted our invitation to deliver the Memorial Lecture.

Maulana Azad, to commemorate whose memory this series of Lectures has been instituted, was a unique personality. A scholar in Arabic and Persian, Maulana Saheb (as he was respectfully and affectionately addressed) belonged essentially to the world of ideas and letters. Among his writings, the *Tarjuman-ul-Quran*, a rational commentary on the Holy Book, occupies pride of place. But this distinguished litterateur and thinker was not destined to be merely a scholar. The fate of his nation and people in colonial bondage stirred him intensely and drew him into the turmoil of politics. "If you like good you have to revile evil and if you want to please God you must not be afraid of displeasing Satan". This was the quintessence of the philosophy of Maulana Saheb. Maulana Azad soon became one of the most articulate and influential leaders of the national movement. A comrade-at-arms of Mahatma Gandhi, Azad was at Pandit Nehru's side when the mantle of governing free India fell on Nehru's shoulders. Azad became his trusted colleague in the formulation and implementation of the new Nation State's progressive policies. Azad's intellectual horizons, however, remained vast. His early eclectic training made him a powerful votary of international understanding and world peace.

This was a goal dear to the heart of the late Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in whose memory this Lecture is being held today. In a speech delivered in 1951, Maulana Azad said "If . . .the achievement of western science can be utilised in the Eastern spirit of man's affinity with God, science could become an instrument not of destruction but for the establishment of human prosperity, peace and progress".

It is befitting that we have today Dr Andreas Papandreou to deliver the Azad Memorial Lecture on the subject "Striving for Peace". It would be difficult to find a world leader more qualified to speak on the subject. Dr Papandreou

acquired his M.A. and Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University and spent nearly twenty years in the academic world devoting himself to teaching and research on a wide range of socio-economic issues. Yet being the son of the late Prime Minister, George Papandreou, he was never very far from the centre of political activities. He worked closely with his father, first as a Deputy in the Greek Parliament and later as a colleague in the Cabinet. He became Prime Minister in 1981 after his party, PASOK, won a resounding victory in the elections. His mandate was renewed in the elections held in June, 1985.

Within the short period of his Prime Ministership, Dr Papandreou has carved out a distinct role for Greece in world affairs. His emphasis on *détente*, peace, international co-operation and on a meaningful North-South dialogue are all too well known to need recapitulation. A crusader against the nuclear arms race, he has actively worked towards the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. We also recall his leading role in working with Smt. Indira Gandhi and later with our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi for the 'Five Continent Peace Initiative' leading to the historic 'Delhi Declaration'.

It is gratifying that Shri Rajiv Gandhi is present at the Lecture today. Dr Papandreou and Shri Gandhi represent the emerging streams of West and East towards world peace and a just world order.

May I welcome you once again, Dr Papandreou, as a distinguished leader from the West, a crusader for peace and a friend of India — and request you to deliver the 1985 Maulana Azad Memorial Lecture. □

R. Venkataraman
Vice-President of India
President, ICCR.

Striving for Peace

THE ISSUE I WOULD LIKE to talk about to you today, in order to pay tribute to this outstanding honour you have given me, is an issue which unites all the peoples of the world, irrespective of their political and social systems, and their level of development; it is the issue of Peace and its defence from the dangers which threaten it today.

Last year marked the passing of forty years since the end of the Second World War. The memories of the tremendous losses and destruction caused throughout almost the

whole world are still fresh. At the end of that war, as a natural human reaction to violence and the holocaust, the Organization of United Nations was founded, with the prime objective of maintaining international peace and security, settling international conflicts by peaceful means and generally taking all appropriate measures for strengthening world peace.

The foundation of the Organization of United Nations, the principles enshrined in its founding Charter and the initial participation of the greater majority of the countries of the world created, in a world weary of the destruction of the war, hope, that at long last the time had come where it might be possible to impose certain fundamental principles on international relations so as to secure peace in the future.

However, the division of the world into competing political and military blocs which followed shortly after the foundation of the United Nations Organization, began to cast a shadow over the hopes of peoples in the world of maintaining peace and securing progress.

In the intervening period since the end of the Second World War, the world has lived through alternating periods of crisis and *détente*. Relations between the two blocs have alternated between times of crisis, where public concern was intensified, and times of *détente*, where hopes were raised as to the possibility of maintaining peace and continuing efforts for further development, progress and the well-being of mankind.

Unfortunately, we are today once again going through an exacerbated crisis which must be dealt with opportunely and appropriately, otherwise we will live through a new tragedy which, given the present state of affairs, especially in the sector of armaments, would mean the total destruction of mankind.

I am referring to the continually increasing international

tension between the United States and the Soviet Union which set off the unbridled arms race, and chiefly nuclear arms at that. Just as dangerous an indication are the ever-increasing number of crisis flashpoints, as well as the increased frequency of recourse to violence for settling international differences.

Suffice it to mention as crisis areas, the Middle East, Cyprus, the Iran-Iraq war, Central America, Afghanistan, Western Sahara and South Africa.

Over the past few years the main characteristic in the relations between the two Superpowers was not 'peaceful', but 'combative' coexistence.

Within the context of this combative coexistence the two Superpowers have devoted their efforts to the increased rate of development of their nuclear arsenals – with the aim, not of a 'balance of terror', but rather nuclear superiority. This arms race has assumed new dimensions because modern technology has given to armaments, especially nuclear armaments, their own dynamics, thus creating potential uncontrollable dangers.

It is difficult to estimate accurately the percentage of destructive ability which each of the Superpowers must have in order to secure its defence and security according to the deterrence doctrine. It is well-known however, that each Superpower has the ability to destroy the other more than ten times over. Each Superpower has the ability to destroy the whole planet at least once. What possible meaning can the concept of strategic balance have then?

One could accept 'strategic balance' being the objective of both Superpowers but this would be only within the context of a mutual reduction of nuclear arsenals. But the exact opposite is the case. 'Strategic balance' is being sought at ever higher levels of armament. This can only mean that the Superpowers are competing to achieve 'superiority'. This is the underlying notion of the SDI

incorporated into the arms programme of the United States.

This arms race now reaches its culmination by being extended out into areas as yet unknown, to space. It is of no significance at all if the militarization of space is cloaked in the concept of 'defence'.

Washington's decision to proceed to a space - defence programme constitutes a contravention of the basic principle incorporated in SALT-I. According to the initial agreement between the two Superpowers, the development of 'defence' weapons against the IBMs was, in essence, prohibited, because this would mean that one of the two sides would be able to construct successfully defence weapons, — would have a very clear superiority which would enable a first strike against one's opponent, without running the danger of a counter-strike. This of course explains the considerable reaction of the Soviet Union to any militarization of space.

On SDI I would like to make the following points:

- **First**, the 'defence' space weapons do not substitute, as is maintained, nuclear weapons. Laser rays would need a nuclear bomb to activate them.
- **Second**, according to existing scientific data, it is not possible to construct an 'umbrella' which would protect a whole continent, such as America. It is also already clear that defence priority would be given to nuclear installations, and not to the unarmed population, within the context of SDI.
- **Third**, any umbrella constructed for the United States would not mean that this could be extended to Europe. This must be seriously taken into account by the Europeans and their governments.
- **Fourth**, given that the United States develop successfully a protective umbrella, the Soviet Union in turn, will increase and develop, both quantitatively and qualitatively, its nuclear weapons so that it will be able

- to go through the ‘gaps’ in the protective umbrella of the United States.
- **Fifth**, it is almost certain that space weapons will become vulnerable as soon as new space weapons are developed by one’s opponent.
- **Sixth**, recent studies show clearly that Laser rays are able to cause fires on a colossal scale and destroy Whole towns in a number of hours — and lead to a nuclear winter.
- **Seventh**, it is certain that the militarization of space will draw upon productive means on a colossal scale, with economic and social repercussions of unknown proportions. We come to the conclusion that the militarization of space will step up the arms race, a race which will bring mankind to the brink of disaster.

A better way for helping peace in the world and the economic conditions of many countries would be to substitute for the world ‘defense’ the world ‘development’ and the term would then become ‘Strategic Development Initiative’for food and basic necessities – high technology for Peace.

Irrefutable scientific evidence contained in studies drawn up by scientists in the East and in the West demonstrate that only a fraction of the existing nuclear arsenal is needed to cause considerable climatological and ecological changes which will destroy the whole planet.

This information thus gives a new, horrific dimension to the possibility of a nuclear winter, first mentioned by the eminent scientist CARL SAGAN in an article in 1983. According to his data, a world nuclear war would, apart from the loss of human life, calculated in millions, have considerable effects on the climate, characterized by a darkening over the earth for many weeks, with temperatures below zero for months, disruption to the climatic norms of the hydro-sphere and dramatic changes to the local weather conditions

and the precipitation percentages.

Thus it can be said that whatever were to remain from the multiple nuclear explosions would be completely destroyed by the nuclear winter to follow.

To this must be added a new study published a few months ago in Washington, drawn up after three years of research by the scientific committee on population (SCOPE) established by the International Council of Scientific Research.

In this new study, which constitutes the first official attempt by the scientific world to calculate the biological consequences of a nuclear winter, the following are mentioned:

- The desolation of 25% to 30% of the inhabited areas of North America, Europe and the Soviet Union.
- The blocking out of 99% of the sun by a dense smoke cloud. Within a few weeks this would extend to the whole of the northern hemisphere blocking out 90% of the light.
- Frost and drought would prevail for several weeks, or even months.
- The spread of a possible famine which would affect even areas beyond that destroyed by the nuclear holocaust.

The scientific evidence mentioned above in summary, demonstrates just how destructive a nuclear war would be for mankind. On that count I think that there can be no shadow of a doubt. A nuclear winter, however, is the result of a possible war. Already mankind is suffering the consequences of the accumulation of means to wage such a war. Apart from the fear and worry caused by an unbridled arms race, there are also economic repercussions, which are already tragic.

On a world scale, defence expenditure in 1950 was 120 billion dollars, and today stands at 800 billion dollars annually. Stopping the arms race and then decreasing considerably nuclear arsenals, with the ultimate objective of doing away

with them altogether, would mean considerable savings and would gradually make available at least part of the colossal sums for other purposes, to cover more immediate needs.

When we consider that in all the countries of the world, more schools, more hospitals, etc. are needed, and that aid in general to the Third World is so vital, then we come to the conclusion that the distribution of resources today is completely irrational. What is even more tragic is that these very countries in the Third World have been swept away by the general climate of tension in the arms race and thus become poorer and poorer, day by day.

Despite the tremendous effects of a nuclear arms race, the Geneva negotiations on nuclear weapons were broken off in 1983 due to the differences of opinions on the installation of INF weapons on European soil. In the intervening period until the resumption of talks, the two Superpowers sought additional superiority advantages, despite the increased danger involved.

The resumption of the Geneva talks must be seen as a very important step in re-establishing dialogue between East and West, thus creating new hopes for the peoples of the earth.

However, in order for these new hopes not to be dashed once again, the contents of the negotiations must be substantial.

It is within this spirit that the meeting between President Reagan and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union must be seen — as an important step in promoting dialogue between East and West. This initial meeting between the two leaders nurtured great hopes for many peoples, when taking into account that this meeting took place on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations Organization, the tenth anniversary since the signing of the Final Act of Helsinki and the 40th anniversary of the

tragic first explosion of the atom bomb over Hiroshima. I would like to hope that hearing the call of all the nations of the world, they will be able to find the possibility for substantial negotiations aimed at stopping nuclear armaments on this planet and in space in their future meetings. We must not lose hope for a new period of *détente*, peace and disarmament.

The recent proposal of Gorbachev to do away with nuclear weapons altogether – to be completed by the year 2000 is truly worthwhile, and we sincerely hope that it is accepted by Washington or at least it constitutes the subject of dialogue between the Superpowers.

However, securing peace must not be seen as the exclusive task of the nuclear powers. The danger of total extermination of mankind and the economic ruin which weaker economies have been brought to, due to the consequences of armaments, makes the attempt at defending peace a matter of top priority for every country, for every individual.

Though a small country, Greece has made crystal-clear the fact that it will make its voice heard on crucial issues facing mankind today. We are willing to contribute with all means at hand to all the efforts aimed at defending peace and human life on our planet.

So far, my government has taken certain initiatives in this direction. The first is the establishment of denuclearized zones in Balkans. Despite initial difficulties, the first experts' meeting was held in Athens, where representations from all the Balkan countries – with the exception of Albania – discussed issues of co-operation and security, including the establishment of a denuclearized zone. The representations decided to repeat their work within a few months in Bucharest with the intention of calling a Balkan Summit Conference for this purpose.

I consider this Balkan initiative to be very important, because after further talks, together with the initiatives

in the area of Scandinavia and the Palme proposal to create a denuclearized corridor in Central Europe, this would lead to the establishment of a very long denuclearized zone in Europe, from North to South. This might point the way for others to follow, to improve the political climate in Europe, and we hope, lead to a general nuclear disarmament throughout the whole of Europe. Recently a proposal was put forward to create a Balkan zone free of chemical weapons. This is an important initiative, because the destruction which chemical weapons might cause surely are not negligible to human life and the environment.

The second initiative is our proposal for a six-month delay in deploying the Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe. Despite the fact that our proposal was not officially accepted, I think it is important to point out that mass movements and organizations in Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and other European countries are stepping up their fight against the deployment of the missiles. The main opposition parties, such as the Labour Party in Great Britain, and the Social Democrats in West Germany, took an official position against this deployment, and as yet it is not known when or if Holland will proceed to such a deployment.

Our third initiative was, together with the President of Rumania, Nicolae Ceaucescu to make a public announcement and to draw up a confidential letter to the President of the United States and the then President of the Soviet Union. We appealed to them, pointing out the danger of an unbridled arms race, and we proposed measures to reduce existing tension, and urged the resumption of dialogue and negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Our fourth initiative was together with the Prime Minister of Finland Mr Sorsa, and the Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr Palme, on the 6th of June 1984, to launch a common appeal to reduce nuclear arms in Europe and to continue efforts at establishing denuclearized zones in Northern

Europe and the Balkans, as well as a corridor free of any 'theatre warfare' nuclear weapons in Central Europe.

I have left till last, because I consider it to be of considerable importance, the active participation of Greece in the Initiative of the Five Continents for Peace and Disarmament. It is the initiative of the Six Leaders, which we started with the late Smt. Indira Gandhi, and which the present Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi has continued.

I think you are well acquainted with the efforts of the members of this initiative, as well as the contents of the Delhi Declaration. Thus I will restrict myself to a few thoughts, which I think underline the development and effectiveness of the initiative in the future.

The most forceful means we have at hand at present is the will expressed by millions of inhabitants from almost all countries for opposition to be exerted against nuclear armaments. This popular will constitutes a considerable political pressure on the Superpowers, and is the strongest weapon in helping to establish a process which will put an end to nuclear armaments.

The response so far to this initiative, from governments, associations, movements and mass organizations, has been more than positive. It has been enthusiastic and at times dynamic. Thousands of personalities, scientists, church leaders, artists, writers and ordinary people in their letters have expressed their faith in the initiative and urge us to continue and step up our efforts for the good of mankind.

Just before the Summit meeting in Geneva, on the 24th of October 1985, we extended a common message to the two leaders, urging them to come to substantial dialogue; we proposed a postponement of all nuclear tests for at least one year, and we offered our good offices in order to facilitate the establishment of effective verification arrangements on our own territories subsequently, after the Summit. The one Superpower, the Soviet Union, effectively accepted our

offer for verification, even on its territory.

We are determined to continue relentlessly our efforts. The Initiative of the Six, even if it does not ultimately achieve a direct stop to nuclear arms, will have underscored to public opinion the dangers and the destructive consequences of a possible nuclear conflict.

We believe that the critical nature of the situation and the increasing concern of world public opinion at the possibility of a nuclear holocaust, will constitute decisive factors in the rapid increase of an international movement which will embrace almost all political and social forces. We believe that this movement will act as a pressure lever for a real restriction of arms and the imperative shift of substantial sums towards social and developmental purposes.

We believe that, just as each individual has the inviolable right to life, so each citizen on this planet has, irrespective of any other political, economic and social condition, the fundamental right to peace. That is why our struggle for peace is a noble one for the individual himself and his survival.

Everything that lives wants to survive. The dandelion pushing its yellow head through the green grass, the scraggy mountain brush squeezing through the cracks of rock, the sea creatures, insects, animals and human beings – all life fights to survive.

And now we have the possibility not only to survive, but to develop a new global consciousness that changes our age-old conceptions of war as a fact of life, a part of the nature of the human psyche, a substitute new way of functioning – without violence – a system of peace.

Human beings developed the technology for total destruction; human beings can develop the social awareness and the political will for peace.

There is little time, but we all have the faith that the possibility of moving our world to a society beyond war exists, and it is with this faith and commitment that I spoke to you here tonight. □

January 25, 1986

Andreas G. Papandreu
Prime Minister of Greece

